

LAW OFFICES OF
MCGINN INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW GROUP, PLLC

A PROFESSIONAL LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY
PATENTS, TRADEMARKS, COPYRIGHTS, AND INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW
8321 OLD COURTHOUSE ROAD, SUITE 200
VIENNA, VIRGINIA 22182-3817
TELEPHONE: (703) 761-4100
FACSIMILE/DATA: (703) 761-2375; 761-2376
E-MAIL: ADMIN @ MCGINNIP.LAW.COM
SENDER'S E-MAIL: JHOWARD@ MCGINNIP.LAW.COM

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

SEP 06 2006

SEAN M. MCGINN
PHILLIP E. MILLER†
FREDERICK E. COOPERRIDER†
JAMES E. HOWARD†
JOHN J. DRESCH
SCOTT M. TULINO
DONALD J. LECHER
PETER F. MCGEE†
JOHN W. FITZPATRICK†
†MEMBER OF BAR OTHER THAN VA

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

September 6, 2006

VIA FACSIMILE

To: Examiner Tuan Pham
Group Art Unit: 2618
U.S.P.T.O.

Facsimile No.: (571) 273-8300

From: James E. Howard

Facsimile No.: (703) 761-2375 or 76

Re: Enclosed Request for Reconsideration
U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 09/988,319
Docket No.: F-11800

Dear Examiner Pham:

Enclosed for filing is a Request for Reconsideration in response to the Final Office Action mailed on July 6, 2006, which should place the above-referenced case in condition for allowance.

Thank you in advance for your kind consideration on this case.

Very truly yours,


James E. Howard

JEH/geb
Enclosures
Total pages transmitted: 17

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

SEP 06 2006

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of

Kazuya Ozaki

Serial No.: 09/988,319

Group Art Unit:

2618

Filed: November 19, 2001 Examiner:

Pham, Tuan

For: OPENING/CLOSING TYPE PORTABLE INFORMATION TERMINAL

Honorable Commissioner of Patents
Box AF
Alexandria, VA 22313 - 1450

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION

Sir:

This paper is in preparation for imminent appeal and in response to the Office Action dated July 6, 2006.

Claims 1-6, 8-18, and 20-22 are all the claims presently pending in the application.

Claims 1 and 8-9 are independent.

Applicant notes that, notwithstanding any claim amendments herein or later during prosecution, Applicant's intent is to encompass equivalents of all claim elements.

Claims 1, 4, 6, 8-9, and 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gray (U.S. Patent No. 5,485,517) in view of Narayanaswamy, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,144,358). Claims 2-3, 5, 10-12, 14-16, 18, and 20-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gray in view of Narayanaswamy and further in view of Kfoury (U.S. Patent No. 6,549,789). Claim 17 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gray in view of Narayanaswamy and further in view of Kfoury and further in view of Lim (U.S. Patent No. 6,628,974).

These rejections are respectfully traversed in the following discussion.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY